

neither  
He describes <sup>neither</sup> either faithfully or accurately.

What Posner reports to as Arnold's "testimony" is in fact and ~~FBI~~ account of what it says she said that she never saw ~~when they turned it in~~. Compounding Posner's offense in referring to the statement the FBI never showed Arnold before it was sent to Washington is his writing that "she "gave" two different FBI statements. " This is a lie.

Neither ~~Wicky-Sourcer~~ Posner nor anyone else knows what she <sup>actually</sup> told the FBI that it used in the first <sup>of its reports, in an FBI</sup> FD-302 report form, the one dated November 26. Posner quotes selectively from this <sup>report</sup> report in a way that <sup>is overthly</sup> makes it dishonest. He says the <sup>FBI</sup> report says that

she might, Posner's words, "have caught a fleeting glimpse of Oswald in the first floor hallway." <sup>253 A NW</sup> The FBI's <sup>Oswald is precise, not</sup> positioning is ~~precise and not just in any hallway~~; "standing in the hallway between the front door and the double doors leading to the warehouse." <sup>while</sup> ~~which is consistent with what~~ Robert ~~McNeil~~, then of NBC-TV news, said he saw Oswald when he sought a phone and Oswald directed him to one.

Posner quotes Arnold as saying about her seeing Oswald, "she <sup>could</sup> not be sure." That ~~is what the FBI reports says~~, but ~~it is not all it says~~. What Posner omitted, nothing omitted here, is what follows immediately in that report, "but she <sup>after "sure!"</sup> felt it was," meaning <sup>w</sup> Oswald.

The FBI and the Commission had the same problem Posner has to be, like them, dishonest about: if Oswald was at that time on the first floor he could not possible have been the assassin.

The ~~FBI~~ report times this as Arnold did not, consistent with ~~make it possible for~~ Oswald to have gotten up to the sixth floor after Arnold saw he. It merely stated 12:15 instead of what she said, 12:25. <sup>455 ends here</sup>

The FBI tried similar shenanigans with her second statement, ~~that diligent scholar~~ of the records <sup>reflects this</sup> that he is Posner ~~was ignorant of~~ <sup>his</sup> compounding that serious offense, writing prejudicially from ~~gross ignorance~~, he just plainly, straight-out lies in saying, his words, "in the second statement she did not see him at all." His supposed source <sup>second of those two FBI records I published facing each other</sup> in this is the ~~one cited about that I did it is ignorant literary thievery~~.

What this self-professed outstanding expert who is really an astounding subject-matter <sup>miss</sup> ignorant ~~does~~ does not tell his readers, probably because he did not ~~know~~, is that

Arnold's second statement was not even to the FBI at all! It was to the Commission, which had asked the FBI to obtain them. It asked the FBI to ask each and every Depository employee, the identical questions prepared by the Commission!

One of those questions is where the employee was at the time of the shooting.

In response to that, ~~this is what the~~ <sup>this is</sup> statement Arnold signed really says, my emphasis: ~~quotes in the ret copy retyped by the FBI:~~

"I did not see LEE HARVEY OSWALD at the time President was shot."

The irrepressible liar in Posner converted this to her saying she did not see Oswald at all: Posner's words again, "in the second statement she said she did not see him at all." <sup>(my emphasis)</sup>

What happened is what usually happens, the FBI agents write the statement they then asked be signed. Still determined not to have any statement from Arnold that she was here she could have seen Oswald <sup>when</sup> and said she "felt" she had, that word also the FBI's, and we have no way of knowing what she actually said, Agent E.J. Robertson, in writing out what he wanted Arnold to sign, contrived to have her not say what she had said.

As it is typed, she said, again the FBI's quotes, "I left the Texas School Book Depository Building at about 12:25 PM, November 22, 1963." In the retyped copy the letters "AM" are higher, off the straight line of the rest of the typing. She does suggest <sup>did mistake</sup> corrections, ~~in fact there were~~ several. When Robertson wrote the statement for Arnold to sign, to be certain it did not quote her as being <sup>at that time,</sup> when no official wanted he have been, where her seeing Oswald <sup>Robertson wrote</sup> precluded his having been the assassin, ~~he out down~~ "AM"! That is one of several corrections Arnold made in handwriting.

~~This record does more than contradict Posner: it makes liar of him. And my copy disappeared from her file folder in that "subject" file in which Posner worked and from which, as he avoids mentioning in his Acknowledgement, he made seven hundred and twenty-four copies by his wife's own count.~~ <sup>255 fol</sup>

~~(Published both in facsimile on facing pages, 210-1, of Photographic Whitewash)~~

~~Getting back to that, I emphasis ignorant because this arrogant man is a bluffer and a blowhard on fact while blistering all sorts of criticisms, mostly petty, as all others to build himself up, he after all his bragged of work remains ignorant about how the FBI prepares its records for filing and files them. He also is after all he wrote~~

That one change Arnold made I'll never forget because of what it means. The other changes, and there were not many, I can no longer specify because it, too, disappeared from my "Arnold" subject-file folder. I do not know when it disappeared but it was after the Posner's worked in this "subject" file, <sup>they were</sup> the last to use it, <sup>1-10-65</sup> and when I sought it for this writing. Aside from those other changes had an real importance, which I am inclined not to believe, the one purpose ~~served~~ <sup>was</sup> served by my not having the copy of the handwritten original is that I cannot document the deliberateness with which the FBI sought for the second time in only two statements <sup>made</sup> and with this one witness, to change the time she said she ~~did~~ <sup>did</sup> saw Oswald. That she changed it does mean she regarded that as important and that she is firm in her recollection. What she did from the time she left her office and when she left her office do confirm her recollection and the change she made to record it. She had not left her office at 12:25 p.m., and anyone later seeing a.m. after the time could not cite it with that error in it. Obviously, people are not usually at work just after midnight.

Twenty or more years before Posner claims to have begun his work, taken his first look at the Commission's publication, <sup>5/</sup> as he knew, I had published those reports in facsimile. Why, then, does he not say that in his note and why ~~does~~ <sup>did</sup> he says in that note what he did say?

If he had abided by the norms of honest scholarship he would have cited the first published source. But throughout his book he does not cite my <sup>work</sup> ~~publications~~ <sup>which he does use and</sup> what he uses from it and does not attribute to it. Where he cites no source for what is my work he <sup>he</sup> thereby takes person/credit, <sup>at</sup> <sup>for</sup> as his work, what is my work. As his own publisher's dictionary describes it, quoted above, that is plagiarism.

Posner's criticisms of me and of my work are petty, wrong in spirit, fact or both, and they in no way reflect my work as his book also does not. <sup>at any point. Since he seeks to</sup> Moreover, ~~over these childish and inconsequential criticisms,~~ <sup>make of himself and his book what neither is, he tries to put all this down.</sup> he did not want to be honest and indicate his indebtedness to my work. So, instead as writers steal, he stole it.

Throughout his book he has unexplained citations to what he gives only in numbers

he does not explain. He does not explain them because of his subject-matter ignorance. He does not know what they mean. This is evident, conspicuous, really, in his end note for his Arnold dishonesty cited above, ~~of~~ of which I here repeat only its ending: "File # DL-80-43". That is not how the FBI places its file identification on its records. And this is the holograph missing from my files in which he worked and from which he admitted making seven hundred and twenty-four copies not at any point indicated or acknowledged in his book.

When Dallas or any other field office generates a record they do not need to include the coded identification of that record and when they send copies elsewhere in the FBI there is no need to use that coded identification and I have never seen it done. Each office has its own file numbers and it knows from the covering letter the office that is the source on those records sent it.

I have never seen the FBI use the number symbol on its records. When it does not spell the word out it uses "Np."

The number "80" is not on that record. Posner misread the number I may have added or added it incorrectly from the <sup>mis</sup> identification <sup>of</sup> it.

But the dash he uses between the first two parts of the identification he has in his note, between the symbol for the office and for the first number the meaning of which he <sup>certainly</sup> ~~certainly~~ does not know is something I do not remember ever seeing the FBI do.

In short, the citation in his note <sup>is</sup> ~~is~~ not by the FBI. It could have been by me but after ~~about twenty-five~~ <sup>all these years</sup> years I do not remember.

In Posner's note he makes <sup>a</sup> ~~himself~~ <sup>himself</sup>, an ignoramus and a fool of himself, as the numbers he knows so little about, the subject and the investigations make clear.

The first number in the <sup>B/</sup> FBI's filing system is the file's classification. At the time of the assassination it was a federal crime to kill a mail carrier but it <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ not a federal crime to kill a president. The assassination changed that.

<sup>Having</sup> ~~having~~ no appropriate number, ~~that~~ the field offices used the classification that seemed most appropriate. It is "89. <sup>A</sup> Assaulting or Killing A Federal Officer." I quote ~~it~~ from an FBI list of those file classifications. *(note - copy as indicated)*

the second number in FBI filing is the identification of the case. In Dallas it was 43 for the JFK assassination. The third is the ~~extra~~ serial number of the record in that file. So far as Posner is concerned, that record had no serial number, yet that serial is not only the means of identifying any record, it also is the means of retrieving it from the central indices. From a file of more than ten thousand serials.

Posner's use of the FBI Classification Number 00 ~~reflects~~<sup>depicts</sup> his ignorance. That is a number for which the field offices have no legitimate need. I put it this way because they use that number for hiding because it is always irrelevant to any search made. It means "Laboratory Research Matters." In the field offices those laboratory records are filed within the main case files of which those lab records are part.

Or, in seeking to hide his thefts from me and <sup>in</sup> representing my work as his work, he proved that he is rather ~~conspicuously~~<sup>subject-matter ignorant</sup> ~~conspicuously~~<sup>boast in no book</sup>. All of this because he was not willing to cite my third book, page 211 as <sup>his</sup> ~~his~~ source!

Frankly, I love it!

— People have been coming for years and copying my records and I have never once asked to be credited as the source. I do not have that kind of ego and I often tell ~~every~~ people to feel free to quote what I have published <sup>and they want</sup> and that they need not credit my books. I did not ask Posner to. But if he did not have this exceptionally <sup>sick</sup> ~~seen~~ ego he would have asked me to explain the file numbers and their meanings to him and he would then not have had all <sup>of</sup> what to most people <sup>is</sup> merely gibberish throughout his end notes. He still need then not have credited me as his source. But he knew what he would do with what he got here and his overweening ego would not let him ask me, then or later, to tell him what those numbers he uses throughout mean and he could then have told his readers.

Others have been here much longer than the three days he and his wife Trisha <sup>will</sup> ~~was~~, much longer and with more people, and what they used was not credited to me and I made no complaints of any kind. This is true also of a professor who specializes in writing about the FBI, only he did not even come here. I was then able to do searching, I searched for him and sent him several hundred pages of FBI records. I am not mentioned in his book, he did not even send me a copy of it, I had no complaints. When I was not able to do the

searching and ~~some~~ rather famous writers wanted copies of my records I have engaged students from Hood College to work for them and I never saw what they copied, never asked to, never checked how many copies they made, was not credited and did not object.

I do ~~not~~ and I never did regard those records I got by FOIA lawsuits as my personal property and I always have regarded those of us who use FOIA and get records by it as surrogates for the people.

Posner knew that. But that Olympic-class ego he has kept him from asking what he should have asked, what I would have told him and he could have told his readers.

Does not the foregoing still again raise the obvious question, can we <sup>believe</sup> ~~trust~~ anything Posner writes?

Can we trust his sourcing?

Can we believe <sup>the</sup> ~~that~~ great amount of <sup>his book</sup> ~~that~~ is not his own and he presents as his own work by giving n source at all?

While that we cannot is flagrant, to one who knows the fact, as Reviewers and reporters and I almost all readers do not, throughout Posner(s) entire book, it is particularly glaring in the preceding chapter and in this one: we cannot trust anything he says <sup>he</sup> ~~cite~~ <sup>cite</sup> without close <sup>and</sup> careful independent confirmation of it.

The man lies as though his very life depends on it.

~~His~~ book does.

extra space

What he says about what Arnold said and what I write about that is enough to justify disregarding the other contrivances he has to pretend that Oswald was in that sixth-floor window, <sup>and</sup> that he was seen there by "dependable" witness, <sup>ed</sup> and his abusive treatment of those he selects of those who on the records said the opposite. We <sup>re</sup> ~~re~~sume with his next conspicuous flaunting of his ignorance of the most basic fact of the crime, <sup>as</sup> he once <sup>display</sup> ~~ain~~ most the most outstanding illustration of his <sup>no</sup> ~~no~~ source ignorance of the most basic, <sup>and</sup> well-known and readily <sup>available</sup> ~~available~~ fact in his references to the motorcade (on page 230)

Of the removal of the <sup>limousine's</sup> ~~limousine's~~ bubble top Posner ~~we~~ writes that "the President and his staff had requested" it. The President alone did. Some of the staff opposed it. Next,

"The motorcycle escort was limited to four, and kept at a comfortable distance from the limousine." Save that there <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ an escort and a limousine, every Ho Sourced word is ~~false~~ false. It is still another virtupso display of ignorance of the basic fact and <sup>of</sup> the ego of ~~scilicet~~ extraordinary size that keeps him from <sup>a</sup> asking simple questions of other than the nuts he regards as important and cannot answer any such questions. <sup>Moreover,</sup> in this ignorance he missed some ~~not~~ pretty big scandals well recorded in my "Subject" file that he spent so <sup>much</sup> time in. But then if he had done a really diligent job of trying to learn the truth he would have been unhappy because he would have found proof ~~that~~ that his book is th fraud that it is. <sup>Some of</sup> ~~From~~ That proof will be published in my NEVER AGAIN! I summarize it below.

There were, as hundreds <sup>of</sup> of school children know, twelve motorcycle escorts, <sup>it was</sup> ~~not~~ an escort "limited to four." ~~and of those four Posner's fertile imagine kept him from~~ <sup>could not and did not</sup> describing their function while he ~~was~~ was engaged in inventing for them their ~~di~~ duties of which he seems to still be unaware.

It is because of one of those several significant scandals that my subject file holds all the records I ~~write~~ use in what follows, all in either or both Dallas JFK assassination ~~in~~ 98-45 main file, or the companion FBI headquarters file, 62-109050. (The ~~62~~ 62 file classification at headquarters represents "Miscellaneous - including Administrative Inquiry." Although as Hoover boasted, he entered the case without authority, this file classification comes from the fact that the President did ask the FBI to investigate the night of the assassination so it was an "administrative inquiry.")

Those four closest to the limousine were never to ~~be~~ be any distance from it and throughout downtown <sup>a</sup> Dallas they were so close to it and to each other they sometimes did touch each other, in ~~pair~~ pairs because there were two on each side; and when they were close they so <sup>often</sup> times forced onlookers back and on at least one occasions people ~~were~~ were thrown back. <sup>of this four</sup> Their purpose was to provide close protection, which is not consistent with whatever Posner had in mind in ~~asking~~ making up that "comfortable distance" that is just ~~plain~~ both false and ignorant. It <sup>he had</sup> had ~~not~~ paid any attention to the pictures of the motorcade on the three-lane-wide street on which the <sup>the</sup> President was killed he would have seen how close to each other and to the limousine they were.

Four only? Posner says <sup>supposedly</sup> that when he quotes and makes serious misuse of the testimony ~~of~~ <sup>one</sup> ~~one~~ of those four, Harrison Baker?

If he were really the Perry/Mason type he <sup>Posner</sup> pretends to be he would have been a teensy-weensy bit curious about <sup>why</sup> what nobody spoke to the two of those four <sup>closest</sup> ~~closest~~ to the President when he was killed. Not the Commission, not the FBI or another agency. Until more than <sup>decade</sup> ~~decade~~ later, when even that was kept secret until I got copies <sup>by</sup> ~~in~~ FOIA litigation and yes, those records are duplicated in the "subject" file in which <sup>Posner</sup> ~~he~~ spent most of his time those three days he <sup>was</sup> ~~as~~ here.

Hoover's abuses of the Dallas police for being correct and truthful when that embarrassed him and the FBI guaranteed that when that silliness of breaking off all relations ran its course, relations ~~would~~ <sup>would</sup> not be the best. As scandals were precipitated by Jack Revill's reporting of what Hosty said to him <sup>The afternoon of the assassination</sup> so was another when an agent was needed by a ~~the~~ Dallas ~~of~~ policeman about what one of that dozen escorting "jockkeys" as they called themselves had said. Covering his own ass being the second law <sup>of</sup> the FBI and of survival in it and the first being covering the FBI's, he wrote a ~~the~~ report. Other ~~ass~~ ~~ass-~~ covering soon got that report to headquarters where the asses to be cover ~~ed~~ there got it onto the desk of then Director, Clarence Kelley. He, knowing nothing about that escort that had been ignored with such successful devotion, wrote on the bottom of that report a question, "how many were there" <sup>refering to</sup> ~~is~~ that escort.

That triggered other ass-covering needs, especially in Dallas, and still new needs to be able to continue to hide what had been hidden all along, what those Dallas "jockeys" knew and saw.

Dallas had real problems. It solved them immediately by more of the same, with a little that was new and without what would have really caused a commotion. This, also <sup>is</sup> in NEVER AGAIN! I merely summarize.

On the limousine's right and closest to the President were, immediately next to him, the late Jim Chaney, On Chaney's right was the late Douglas Jackson, Knowing what each could have said I <sup>was</sup> particularly interested in what the Dallas office reported of its years-late first interviews with them. It went quite well for coverers up. But it



*did tell*  
~~told~~ me about Jackson what either I did not know or did not remember if I had known. When he got home the night of the assassination, <sup>proud</sup> Jackson, because it was because it <sup>was</sup> ~~as~~ ~~the~~ second time he had escorted his President, and distressed because having seen so much so close up nobody talked to him, not his own police department and not anyone from any federal agency, wrote out a lengthy and detailed account of his day. He offered it to the FBI when questions <sup>id</sup> in reaction to Kelley's question, and the FBI did not accept it.

I asked my friend Henry Wade, then still Dallas County District Attorney, if he would please ask Jackson to lend me his statement or make a copy and sent it to me. ~~hen~~ When Henry got it he had his secretary retype it. She was faithful to the spelling and punctuation errors.

The reason all police of all ranks and ~~ag~~ <sup>is</sup> agencies avoided Jackson because he was looking and he saw the second shot hit Connally alone.

In the Dallas FBI report on the Chaney interview, like its Jackson interview saying nothing about what Chaney said he saw, there was nothing to alarm Kelley and after ~~he~~ he got those two FBI pseudo-interviews with ~~eight~~ two of the remaining eight uninter-  
<sup>motorcycle</sup>  
~~viewed~~ members of that ~~limousine~~ escort he asked no more about it.

*261A+B home*  
 I knew what ~~Ch~~ <sup>g</sup> Chaney said he saw because someone ~~who~~ <sup>on tape</sup> heard him say it when on the day of the assassination he was interviewed by Radio Station KLIF. I asked Gordon ~~the~~ <sup>me</sup> Clendon, the station's owner, if I could listen to that tape. He told me that although none of his employees could explain it, all their tapes disappeared. He also told me that before whatever happened to ~~them~~ <sup>them did</sup> hap on, he had made a long-laying records that included Chaney and he would give me one.

~~Why Chaney was avoided was soon obvious.~~ He said he had seen the President hit from the front while he was looking right at ~~the~~ <sup>him</sup> President.

If either of these two, <sup>outside the limousine</sup> closest of all the people in the world to the President was interviewed, the official mythology would have been impossible as a non-conspiracy "solution." What Chaney saw ~~made~~ a non-conspiracy theory solution impossible because Oswald could not have shot simultaneously from both the front and the back.

I ~~had~~ <sup>have</sup> two ways of knowing what Chaney saw. One I published in 1965, so there is reason to believe that the FBI knew it and the FBI agents had an understanding of what was not wanted. The other is what I was told by someone who remembered hearing Chaney on tape on Dalls Radjion Station KLIF. I asked Gordon McClendon, the station's owner, if I could listen to those tapes. He told me I'd be ~~welcome~~ <sup>welcome</sup> to if he had them but they no longer existed and none of his <sup>m/</sup> employees could explain their disappearance. But he also told me that before the unexplained disappearance of the assassination-news tapes he had made a long-playing record. He ~~sent~~ <sup>gave</sup> me ~~an~~ <sup>one</sup>. It has the briefest Chaney sound bite. That very ~~be~~ brief excerpt was in itself enough for the FBI to avoid any meaningful questioning of him for a <sup>d</sup> decade and then it avoided what is significant.

The recorded voice of Chaney on that disc has him saying he saw the President ~~hit~~ hit from the front.

Then there is what I published first in 1965. For context there is a little more than what Chaney also saw and told his fellow motorcycle officer <sup>Marrion Baker</sup> from that motorcade ~~escort~~ <sup>escort</sup> about, from Whitewash, page 38:

Texas Attorney General Waggoner Carr was given an opportunity to ask Baker a question. Speaking of the day of the assassination, Carr asked, "Did you have occasion during the rest of the day either in passing visits or idle conversation or anything of that type with any of the people who were there at the time who might have seen something or told you some theory they had about what might have happened?" "Not until last Friday morning," Baker responded. "Chief Lunday ... asked me to go to this Texas Depository Building, and I had - I had worked traffic outside several times but I never did go inside or talk to any of the employees." Carr told Baker he was asking about only the time of the shooting. Baker was never asked what he had learned the Friday morning prior to his testimony at the Book Depository (3H264).

Unsolicitedly, Baker also offered the Commission unwelcome evidence of the invalidity of its conclusion that a single bullet hit both the President and the Governor. He quoted Officer Jim Chaney, one of the four flanking the Presidential car, Chaney said he saw a separate shot hit the Governor and that he had so informed the Chief of Police. Chaney also said, as had Truly and "several officers", that at the time it made the turn into Elm Street the Presidential car "stopped" (3H266).

Chaney was never called as a witness. (38)

There was no moss on Posner's computer. Like the Commission and all its counsel and the FBI. Posner knew what he had to avoid, on which we have more in the next chapter. Why all had always avoided Chaney, who was right next to JFK when he was assassinated, and until the FBI had to see him and then was able to get away with not asking him is, as with Jackson, obvious. Jackson and Chaney had both seen Connally <sup>alone</sup> ~~with~~ with the

second shot. They, like Linda Kay Willis, destroy Posner's baseless invention that is the very foundation of his book, that the single bullet theory is valid. And Chaney also saw the President hit from the front.

If either Jackson or Chaney, the two closest to JFK and as policemen more qualified as professional observers, had been interviewed, the fetus of that official mythology would have been born dead. A ~~non-conspiracy~~ no-conspiracy theorized solution would have been totally impossible, not only because they prove that Connally had been struck by a separate bullet but also because Oswald could not have fired from both front and back at the same time. In addition,

fol 261B

What Jackson saw eliminates the second ~~a~~ <sup>as</sup> officially-admitted second shot, the one said to have missed, impossible because he <sup>on Connally</sup> saw it impact. It also makes the theory of <sup>by a single bullet</sup> ~~the~~ both the President and the governor having been hit impossible, too, because Jackson saw it hit Connally and only Connally.

Each also disproves Posner's unoriginal but claimed-to-be "solution" impossible, too, for the same and for other ~~reasons~~ reasons.

Posner, not less adept at it that all the many officials who were so forthrightly dishonest and unfaithful to their trust in ignoring what proved them wrong, does as they did. If <sup>subject to</sup> by any chance this is an unfair criticism of Posner, then it he not no less ~~unfair~~ a much broader criticism, of making ~~it~~ only a fraudulent, inadequate, incompetent investigation and then touting it as the most definitive of all, official and ~~unofficial~~ unofficial?

With this for openers on his chapter so appropriately titled for those who read his book, "I'll Never Forget It for As Long As I Live," we can safely <sup>skip</sup> ~~skip~~ through the ~~rest~~ <sup>rest</sup> of it with a few short observations and comments.

On page 234 he repeats an indecency first fabricated by William Manchester in his ~~THE DEATH OF THE PRESIDENT~~ The Death of a President (New York, Harper & Row, 1967), that "~~The~~ Secret Service agents ~~was~~ were slow to react..." Not only is there ~~No~~ basis for this, and unsurprisingly, Posner cites no source, but the obvious fact, ~~obvious to all~~ <sup>obvious to all</sup> ~~save those dominated by monumental egos that lack any support other than hot air,~~ is that the assassination ~~was~~ in what amounted to a cul de sac. There wasn't a thing that could be done with the motorcade or any car in it that <sup>could</sup> in any way have had any effect on what happened. Even if reaction had been slow, as it as not, that could not have made any difference in the world. Whether <sup>in</sup> these than five seconds of the official mythology or in eight seconds of Posner's cribbed timing for his mythology, the cars could make ~~a~~ no turn, <sup>not</sup> go any where other than <sup>in a</sup> ~~straight~~ straight. Again, <sup>o</sup> profound in his ignorance, Posner makes no reference to the capability of that truck-like vehicle so overloaded with security <sup>and other</sup> gadgetry and armor it had no pickup at all. It is simply monstrous to me that for self-aggrandizements and puffing up his own self-concept Posner makes such

outrageous and utterly baseless accusations against selfless and dedicated men who at the constant risk of their own lives did then and on other occasions all that could be done, which then ~~was~~ absolutely nothing except to try to move ~~away~~<sup>my</sup> as rapidly as the tank of a limousine permitted.

In this regard, it is worth comparing what he sells for profit with his complete ~~lack~~<sup>my</sup> of mention of the successful attacks on President ~~Ford~~<sup>Reagan</sup>, Candidate George Wallace and those that failed on President Ford, none preventable.

With his usual ignorance and bias Posner attacks unnamed conspiracy theories who, in his context, mean all who do not agree with him, of insisting "only that the fatal ~~head~~ head shot came from the ~~front~~ front." (Page 237) Aside from this being factually correct as he says it, the doctor ~~who~~ who knew most about it stated ~~that~~ at the ~~press~~ White House press conference as soon as the President was pronounced dead that the anterior neck wound was from the front. Dr. ~~Alcohol~~ ~~Dr~~ Perry repeated this three times. (I have more on this also in NEVER AGAIN! including direct quotations from the official text of that conference.)

Turning then on the same page Posner accuses others who "manipulate the witness statements." At this point Posner himself does precisely that. (~~For~~ For an accurate account of the official evidence on those witness, ~~see~~<sup>see</sup> Whitewash, which although the first book, limited to the official ~~evidence~~ evidence only, gives an accurate account of what they did say and testify to.)

Posner refers to Howard Brennan's generalized description of a fair percentage of the men in ~~the~~ Dallas and without a single Oswald identifier in it as an accurate description "so specific in his description" is a complete fabrication. (Page 249) ~~of Oswald.~~ In fact the night of the assassination, at the police lineup, Brennan did not identify Oswald, who was the centerpiece of that carefully stage ~~d~~ lineup in which Oswald was unique in appearance and in conduct.

What source of Brennan does Posner find so dependable? Having just pontificated that "testimony closer to the event must be given greater weight ~~than~~<sup>a</sup> changes or additions made years later, when the witness's own memory is often ~~mud~~ ~~died~~ or influenced by television programs, films, books and discussion with others" (Page 235) Posner's main

264 is the iposite of "testimony closer to the event," which is all that is i  
264

<sup>source</sup>  
(is the opposite of his "testimony closer to the event, <sup>e</sup> / <sup>as is</sup> all I have in Whitewash that he  
here ignores of those witness, Brennan in particular." It is ~~was~~ ghosted from  
Brennan - in 1987 - by J. Edward Cherryholmes. In Posner's citation this is "EyeWitness  
to History: The Kennedy Assassination as Seen By Howard Brennan (Waco, Texas, Texian  
Press, 1987) (Page 543)

Brennan, not surprisingly, is dutifully ~~thankful~~ to God- for his book( Page 250)

When Brennan had no book to sell thanking the diety was not in his testimony. It is  
from Cherryholmes's words that Posner take his chapter title.

One page 256 Posner states there was "a stiff wind" that <sup>gusts</sup> "sister up to twenty/miles  
an hour assassination day, <sup>he includes</sup> factor ~~present~~ present from his theorizing over the posi-  
tion of tree branches <sup>to include</sup> and on the notion of the lapel of Governor Connally's jacket.

What is remarkable in this chapter supposedly on the ssassination, is how little  
~~it~~ there is on it and how much plain junk is substituted.

And as we have seen still again, for all his big talk and boasts, for all those  
extensive and expensive ads by Random House, for all those ~~or~~ ecstacies ~~in~~ TV and in so  
many reviews, when it gets down to any of the nutty-gritty Posner resorts to overt,  
knowing lies, as in his deliberate lying about what Carol/Arnold did and did not say.

Well, maybe <sup>in time</sup> these added lies will <sup>the</sup> stake in the vampire's heart to buttress  
the-holy-water in his face.

# State In The Vampire's Heart

XXI

*me rifle into the building with*  
 "Not having gotten ~~Os~~ Oswald with that rifle into the building that morning, <sup>No Source</sup> Posner  
~~alone there on the sixth floor~~  
 then fabricates a case placing him ~~there~~ at a time refuted by ~~the~~ the police records  
 of what Oswald told them on interrogation. Here is Posner's <sup>of</sup> invention of "evidence":

*arguments have been made. (No source could have cited my book)*  
 "There was actually one Book Depository employee on the sixth floor near noon, but  
 since he did not ~~see~~ anyone, that Oswald was not ~~there~~ there." Posner refers to Bonnie Ray  
 Williams who own time accounts varied. But Posner does say that Oswald was there. He  
 repeats <sup>this</sup> ~~that~~ next on the same page ( 228) in his No Source Needed role:

<sup>W</sup>  
 "While reliable testimony from the Depository places Oswald, ~~alone~~, on the sixth f  
 floor at noon, witnesses in <sup>e</sup> early Plaza also confirm there was a man in that nsiper's-  
 nest window."

We have already had the aroma of those Posner regards as "dependable." Here he  
 names <sup>decent fabricator</sup> not a single person, "reliable" "reliable" of otherwise. Aside from the ~~reliability~~  
 of his misuse of "confirm," there being nothing to confirm, Posner then <sup>writes, whether</sup>  
~~xxxxxxx~~ Dirty Dickery again, Posner is careful to omit when those ~~allegedly~~  
 unnamed but allegedly "dependable" ~~xxx~~ people saw any <sup>one</sup> there.

With the vaguest of generalities and irrelevancies, some <sup>picked up</sup> ~~word~~ from Garrison, who  
 brought it to attention, He rambles along with ~~this~~ unsuccessful effort to place Oswald  
 there when he did not and cannot, through page 231

*with its desperate need.*  
 Even the Commission ~~did~~ did not find those odds ~~and~~ ends of reports Posner spends  
 time on really dependable.

Having pretended that Oswald was hidden on the 6th floor all along, when that was  
 not so, No Source Posner ~~again~~ writes that because he as was all alone, <sup>o</sup> "oswald had  
 enough time to <sup>va</sup> assemble the Carcano and move cartons of books to to form a sniper's  
 nest in the southeast corner." No sources again because none of can be sourced and because  
 there is no proof of either ~~r~~ and neither is correct.

<sup>He</sup>  
 Posner makes no mention of the validation of what Oswald told the police about  
 where he was when No Proof Posner insists <sup>Oswald</sup> he was lurking on that sixth floor. Again  
 from Whitewash, again Posner had it and again he claimed to have read and indexed all the

*Commission's published evidence.*

This is also to say that if Posner told the truth about his work and its magnitude he should have known what I cite <sup>is</sup> from Whitewash (page 73) <sup>is</sup> <sup>also</sup> <sup>cited</sup> from the evidence itself but if not from the evidence, <sup>he had it</sup> from my book. Oswald could not possibly have told the FBI ~~or~~ accurately what he saw when he was ~~on~~ the first floor if he had not been there to see it:

As an example of one of the Oswald "lies", it is worth noting that his account of what he did during lunch hour, if one version by FBI Agent Bookhout is believed, is supported by the testimony of the Negro employees. Bookhout and Hosty placed this "on the first floor" (R613), and Bookhout alone said Oswald "recalled possibly two Negro employees walking through the room during this period. He stated possibly one of these employees was called 'Junior'..." (R622). "Junior" Jarman so testified. And had Oswald been anywhere but on the first floor, he would have had no way of knowing this.

Oswald on the first floor at that time <sup>is</sup> could not have been ~~the~~ Oswald's assassin on the sixth floor. So, for the official mythology as for the Posner-type/unofficial mythologies the actual evidence has to be ~~correct~~ corrupted and ignored and they are all up to that.

Consistent with this Posner has to destroy one of the witnesses to Oswald's presence on the first floor at a time that made it impossible for him to have been on the sixth floor firing away.

Posner says of Carolyn Arnold that she "had given two different <sup>FBI</sup> statements ~~to~~ <sup>in it.</sup> shortly after the assassination." (page 227) Dirty writing again ~~for~~ from a specialist. No private person gives "an FBI statement." They can give a statement to the FBI or the FBI can take a statement from them. Why then this tricky formulation from an experienced writer? *Because he needs it, the truth clunging him his boots and the bullets from it.*

He then quotes selectively from the FBI records to which he refers, <sup>He</sup> and ~~had~~ this note (on Page 540): "Testimony of Mrs. R.E. Arnold, CE 1381, WC Vol XXII, p. 635; FBI statement of Mrs. R.E. Arnold, November 26, 1963, File # DL 80-43."

Shystein <sup>a</sup> and he gives it way by using my work <sup>as</sup> <sup>by</sup> his own and being ignorant in that literary ~~the~~very. *252 A here*

First of all, Arnold did not "testify." <sup>Even.</sup> That is a Posnerian ~~is~~ reference to what I published in <sup>Posner had it</sup> *It Spring of 1971* in *Photographic Whitewash*, page 240. ~~What Posner had. So~~ long before he started writing and pretending that he had invented the wheel, and discovered sex, he knew of this, then the only publication <sup>of</sup> of those two records. ~~Neither of~~



I published these two statements ~~statements~~ in facsimile in Photographic Whitewash in early 1967. (facing pages 210-1)

at that point. ~~That Posner edited from~~  
 ¶ That is only part of what that FBI report says ~~in that sentence~~ Posner edited ~~to have~~  
 that sentence ~~to have~~, I underscore.  
 it say and mean other than Arnold did. Before Posner employed those special talents he  
 displays throughout his book that <sup>report</sup> sentence, as I published it in facsimile, actually  
~~at that point what I quote, I underscore~~  
 says, ~~what Posner omitted underscore~~, is: *in his supposedly direct quotation of it:*

"As she was standing in front of the building, she stated she thought she caught a fleeting glimpse of LEE HARVEY OSWALD standing in the hallway between the front door and the double doors leading to the warehouse, located on the first floor. She could not be sure but she felt that was Oswald."

Omitting these last six words <sup>particularly</sup> is (dishonest and as we have seen, he made it dishonest so he could give a dishonest interpretations to what the FBI said Arnold said. That dishonesty is a precondition for the survival of Posner's book because with Oswald <sup>then on the first floor</sup> there he could not have been that sixth-floor assassin.

Where Arnold placed Oswald is consistent with where Robert MacNeil, then of NBC-TV News; saw Oswald when he asked Oswald where he could get a phone and Oswald directed him to the one he used.

This FBI report misstates the time, as I noted in publishing its two related documents. It misstated the time because, like the Commission and Posner, it had the problem of being able to pretend that Oswald was in the sixth-floor window. At the time Arnold left the building and "felt" she saw Oswald, getting Oswald in his alleged firing position was impossible. So, by taking ten minutes from the time Arnold gave, the FBI made that "possible."

Arnold said it was 12:25 p.m. The FBI said she said 12:15 p.m.

How can those self-righteous of the Commission staff explain their failure to demand that this be done when not one of them was directed to get the necessary investigation made?

*Holmes, not Cops ↓*

IS Posner REALLY an investigator when he made no effort to learn the truth? Is his failure, his disinterest, confirmation that he began self-cast in an entirely different role, the role we are uncovering

# # # # # # # # #

XXI - Stake in the Vampire's Heart

Not having gotten the rifle into the building with Oswald that morning, No-Source Posner then fabricates a case placing hm alone on the sixth floor at a time refuted by police records of what Oswald told them on interrogation. Here is Posner's invention of "evidence":

"There was actually one Book Depository employee on the sixth floor near noon, but since he did not <sup>see</sup> anyone, arguments have been made that Oswald was not there. " Posner refers to Bonnie Ray Williams who own time accounts varied. But Posner does say that Oswald was there. He repeats this on the same page (228) in his No Source Needed role:

"While reliable testimony from the Depository places Oswald, alone, on the sixth floor at noon, witnesses in Dealey Plaza also confirm there was a man in that sniper's nest window."

P/W We have already had the aroma of those Posner regards as "dependable"  
 Here he names not a single person, "reliable" or otherwise. Aside from the  
 S/ deceitfulness of his misuse of "confirm," there being nothing to confirm,  
 Posner then, ~~Dirty Dickery~~ again, is careful to omit when those unnamed  
 but allegedly "dependable" people saw anyone there. *It's his*

3/ With the vaguest of generalities and irrelevancies, some picked up from  
 # Garrison, who brought it to attention, he rambles along through page 231  
 with his unsuccessful effort to place Oswald there when he did not and  
 cannot.

— Even the Commission, with its <sup>separate</sup> need, did not find those odds and  
ends of reports Posner spends time on really dependable.

Having pretended that Oswald was hidden on the 6th floor all along, when  
 that was not so, No Source Posner writes that because he was all alone,  
 "Oswald had enough time to assemble the Carcano and move cartons of  
 books to form a sniper's nest in the southeast corner." No source again  
 because none of it can be sourced and because there is no proof of either  
 and neither is correct.

He makes no mention of the validation of what Oswald told the police  
 about where he was when No Proof Posner insists Oswald was lurking on  
 that sixth floor. Again from WHITEWASH, again Posner had it and again  
 he claimed to have read and indexed all the commission's published  
 evidence. *0/3*  
 z

This is also to say that if Posner told the truth about his work and its magnitude he should have known what I cite from Whitewash (page 73) is from the cited evidence itself but if not from the evidence, he had it from my book. Oswald could not possibly have told the FBI accurately what he saw when he was on the first floor if he had not been there to see it:

*indent*

-- "As an example of one of the Oswald "lies", it is worth noting that his account of what he did during lunch hour, if one version by FBI Agent Bookhout is believe, is supported by the testimony of the Negro employees. Bookhout and Hosty placed this "on the first floor" (R613), and Bookhout alone said Oswald "recalled possibly two Negro employees walking through the room during this period. He stated possibly one of these employees was called 'Junior'..." (R622). "Junior" Jarman so testified. <sup>and</sup> had Oswald been anywhere but on the first floor, he would have had no way of knowing this." --

#

Oswald on the first floor at that time could not have been the assassin on the sixth floor. So, for the official mythology as for the Posner-type unofficial mythologies the actual evidence has to be corrupted and ignored and they are all up to that.

Consistent with this Posner has to destroy one of the witnesses to Oswald's presence on the first floor at a time that made it impossible for him to have been on the sixth floor firing away.

Posner says of Carolyn Arnold that she "had given two different FBI statements shortly after the assassination." (page 227) Dirty writing again from a specialist in it. No private person gives "an FBI statement." They can give a statement ~~TO~~ the FBI or the FBI can take a statement from them. Why then this tricky formulation from an experienced writer? Because he needs it, the truth denying him his book and the bucks from it.

He then quotes selectively from the FBI records to which he refers. He has this note (on page 540): "Testimony of Mrs. <sup>6 2</sup>R.E. Arnold, CE 1381, WC Vol XXII, p. 635; FBI statement of Mrs. R.E. Arnold, November 26, 1963, File #DL 80-43."

Shysterism, and he gives it away by using my work as his own and by being ignorant in that literary thievery. I published these two statements in facsimile in <sup>photographic</sup> WHITEWASH in early 1967. (facing pages 210-1)

First of all, Arnold did not "testify", ever. That is a Posnerian reference to what I published. Posner had it long before he started writing and pretending that he had invented the wheel and discovered sex, he knew of this, then the only publication of those two records. He describes neither faithfully nor accurately.

What Posner refers to as Arnold's "testimony" is in fact an FBI account of what IT says SHE said that she never saw. Compounding Posner's offense in referring to the statement the FBI never showed Arnold before it was sent to Washington is his writing that "she" gave "two different FBI statements. " This is a lie.

It takes -  
not  
Cops

Neither tricky-sourcer Posner nor anyone else knows what she actually told the FBI that it used in the first of its reports, on an FBI FD-302 report form, the one dated November 26. Posner quotes selectively from this report in a way that is overtly dishonest. He says the FBI report says that she might, Posner's words, "have caught a fleeting glimpse of Oswald in the first floor hallway." <sup>11</sup> That is only part of what that FBI report says at that point. Posner edited that sentence to have it say and mean other than Arnold did. Before Posner employed those special talents he displays throughout his book that report, as I published it in facsimile, actually says at that point what I quote. I underscore what Posner omitted in his supposedly direct quotation of it:

" AS SHE WAS STANDING IN FRONT OF THE BUILDING, SHE STATED SHE THOUGHT SHE CAUGHT A FLEETING GLIMPSE OF LEE HARVEY OSWALD STANDING IN THE HALLWAY BETWEEN THE FRONT DOOR AND THE DOUBLE DOORS LEADING TO THE WAREHOUSE, LOCATED ON THE FIRST FLOOR. SHE COULD NOT BE SURE BUT SHE FELT THAT WAS OSWALD."

(Refer to original ms page 253A)

Omitting these last six words is particularly dishonest and as we have seen, he made it dishonest so he could give dishonest interpretations to what the FBI said Arnold said. That dishonesty is a precondition for the survival of Posner's book because with Oswald there, on the first floor, he could not have been that sixth-floor assassin.

Where Arnold placed Oswald is consistent with where Robert MacNeil, then of NBC-TV News saw Oswald when he asked Oswald where he could get a phone and Oswald directed him to the one he used.

11/9/75

11/9/75

not  
copy  
Hall's

This FBI report mis-states the time, as I noted in publishing its two related documents. It misstates the time because, like the Commission and Posner, it had the problem of being able to pretend that Oswald was in the sixth-floor window. At the time Arnold left the building and "felt" she saw Oswald, getting Oswald in his alleged firing position was impossible. So, by taking ten minutes from the time Arnold gave, the FBI made that "possible".

Arnold said it was 12:25 P.M. The FBI said she said 12:15 P.M.

The FBI tried similar shenanigans with her second statement. Posner reflects